



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/562,951	04/20/2006	Brian Anderton	0380-P03923US0	8723
110	7590	03/22/2010		
DANN, DORFMAN, HERRELL & SKILLMAN 1601 MARKET STREET SUITE 2400 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-2307			EXAMINER	
			STEADMAN, DAVID J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1656	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/22/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/562,951	ANDERTON ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	David J. Steadman	1656

**All Participants:**

(1) David J. Steadman.

**Status of Application:** after final rejection

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Kathleen Rigaut.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 21 January 2010

**Time:** approximately 2 PM

**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant     Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes     No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

22, 27

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/David J. Steadman/  
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1656

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted Ms. Rigaut to notify applicant's representative that the after-final amendment filed on 1/12/10 would not be entered and to explain the reasons for non-entry. The examiner noted that while the amendment to claim 22, which was the single claim discussed during the interview of 1/7/10, does not appear to require further consideration and a new search, the amendment to claim 27 would require further consideration and a new search. The examiner noted that claim 27 as filed on 2/3/09 encompasses the alternative limitations a "fragment" or a "derivative" of "full length tau protein" of SEQ ID NO:2 and the 103(a) rejection is based on a fusion of full length tau protein of SEQ ID NO:2 with a polyhistidine tag as being encompassed by a "fragment or derivative of full length tau protein". However, the examiner noted that claim 27 as filed on 1/12/10 is amended to delete the alternative "derivative" such that the claim is now limited to "a fragment of SEQ ID NO:2", which excludes a full length tau protein of SEQ ID NO:2 with the addition of a polyhistidine tail. The examiner noted that by limiting the claim to "a fragment of SEQ ID NO:2" in claim 27, at least a new search is required.